



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

On the death of George IV. in 1830, Mrs. Fitzherbert asked that her letters to him might be returned to her. The Duke of Wellington, who was then Prime Minister, refused to grant this request unless she was prepared to hand over the documents in her possession; and for the moment the matter was dropped. In 1833, however, the duke again brought up the question. Mrs. Fitzherbert was then seventy-six, and in the event of her death it was feared that the papers might pass into indiscreet hands. After some negotiation it was agreed that Mrs. Fitzherbert should be allowed to preserve certain papers which she thought necessary to prove her marriage and guard her interests; that these papers should be sealed under the seals of the Duke of Wellington and the Earl of Albemarle, who with Lord Stourton acted for Mrs. Fitzherbert; that the sealed package should be placed in safe custody at Coutts's Bank; and that all other papers, including all the letters which had passed between Mrs. Fitzherbert and George IV., should be burned. The Earl of Albemarle and the Duke of Wellington personally undertook the burning of the letters—a task which occupied several hours. The reserved papers—now for the first time given to the public—include: the certificate of the marriage, dated December 21, 1785; a letter signed by George, relating to the marriage; the will of George IV.; a mortgage on the palace at Brighton; and a memorandum written by Mrs. Fitzherbert, attached to a letter written by the clergyman who performed the marriage ceremony.

It is always a satisfaction to have settled beyond further doubt a question which has been a matter of controversy; but in spite of the flat denial given by Fox and Sheridan in the House of Commons in 1787—a denial which Fox asserted that he made from direct authority—there were very few, even in Mrs. Fitzherbert's lifetime, who did not believe that the marriage had taken place; and since the publication by Charles Langdale of the *Memoirs of Mrs. Fitzherbert* in 1856, the question may be said to have been at rest. The only value of Mr. Wilkins's long story is to be found in the settlement of it for all time by means of the new documentary evidence. One other question it is to be hoped will be finally answered by the publication of this book. Mrs. Fitzherbert left no descendants. Neither as Mrs. Weld nor as Mrs. Fitzherbert in her youthful days, nor during her long connection with George IV., did she have any children; and all claims to royal descent through this illegal marriage are entirely without foundation.

A. G. PORRITT.

Le Pape et l'Empereur, 1804-1815. Par HENRI WELSCHINGER.
(Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1905. Pp. iv, 473.)

IN this work M. Welschinger has studied the conflict between Napoleon and Pius VII. from the morrow of the Concordat to the fall of the Empire. The development of the controversy, which became an open rupture in 1809 when French troops occupied Rome and carried off the pope to Savona, is briefly sketched, leaving the bulk of the

book for a detailed account of the repeated efforts of Napoleon to obtain from Pius VII. some settlement of the points at issue which would be in harmony with imperial ideas and plans.

The book is not exclusively or even principally a work of original research. At all available points the author has made free use of the labors of Artaud, Haussonville, Chotard, and others. In all such cases, however, he has displayed independence in the handling of his authorities and has usually been able to supplement them somewhat from his own investigations. Upon the ecclesiastical councils of 1809 and 1811 he has found in the *Archives Nationales* some valuable and hitherto unutilized materials which have enabled him to tell the story of those gatherings more in detail than was possible hitherto. Chapters v.-vii., which deal with these subjects, are a distinct contribution to knowledge.

The author's conception of history and his point of view upon the particular questions involved in the subject before him permeate the book from the first page to the last. He thinks of history as a moral science, and is frankly the partizan of the Catholic church and of Pius VII. Unquestionably the book suffers from these qualities. The subject is one which in a peculiar degree calls for a point of view which can regard the existence of antipodal ideas upon the subject of church and state as something normal and as the natural consequence of historical forces at work for centuries. It also requires a cool, dispassionate treatment which simply seeks to ascertain what was done and to explain the proceedings of the various actors with real intellectual sympathy for their varying points of view.

Aside from his conception of history and his point of view, the author's historical method exhibits grave deficiencies. One of the most perplexing questions that confront the historian of the Napoleonic period is the problem of the memoirs, and within that problem the question of the conversations ascribed to Napoleon. Welschinger does not handle either of them satisfactorily. Occasionally he exhibits scepticism in regard to some statement of a memoir writer or doubts whether a particular remark attributed to Napoleon represents his real thought on the subject, but generally all such materials when in accord with his thesis are treated as if they were of equal value with strictly contemporaneous evidence. A typical instance occurs on pages 213-215, where Talleyrand's *Memoirs* are accepted as authority for an incident at Saint Cloud on June 18, 1811. (Welschinger transfers it to the nineteenth.) Napoleon is represented as overwhelming with reproaches several bishops and as making Cardinal Fesch the particular target for his wrath. The provocation was a report of the first day's proceedings of the National Council which had appeared in the *Moniteur*, and a copy of the paper figured conspicuously in the violent scene which occurred. Talleyrand's account is followed implicitly, even to the words used by Napoleon. It would seem that the suspicions which have been aroused over the authenticity of the Talleyrand *Memoirs* ought to have made the author cautious about accepting any particular incident contained in

them, and especially when the passage in question was certainly written years after the event. It happens, moreover, that the *Moniteur* never published any such report as that which Talleyrand alleges was the occasion for Napoleon's outburst of anger. The fact that Napoleon immediately afterward consented to the selection of Fesch as president of the National Council also casts suspicion upon the authenticity of the entire incident. Possibly Welschinger has some other authority for the affair, but as his text stands it exhibits a singularly faulty method.

The critical apparatus is extremely defective. Many important statements are left without citations. There is no bibliography or discussion of authorities, save here and there a line or two in the text or the notes. There is not even a list of the editions used in the citations. As usual in French monographs, there is no index. Despite these faults, and others which would require a more extended notice, the work has considerable merit. The author's partiality for Pius VII. and his evident exaggeration of the pope's sufferings do not entirely conceal the really heroic resistance which the pope made to the tremendous pressure brought to bear upon him by Napoleon. Some strong, if not altogether conclusive arguments are brought against views of the Savona note of May 19, 1811, and the Fontainebleau Concordat which hitherto have been widely received.

FRANK MALOY ANDERSON.

The Duke of Reichstadt (Napoleon the Second). By EDWARD DE WERTHEIMER. (London and New York: John Lane Company. 1905. Pp. xvi, 463.)

THIS is a free and very readable translation of Wertheimer's excellent German volume published in 1902. To the historian its value lies in its scholarly method and the new materials on which it is based. Welschinger in his *Roi de Rome* (1897), aside from some rather meagre sources in the Paris archives, contented himself mainly with printed material—old pamphlets and memoirs (especially those of Prokesch-Osten and Montbel); he made a personal visit to Vienna, but regretted to find that the Austrian archives, both public and private, "soient peu abondantes aujourd'hui en documents relatifs au fils de Napoléon" (preface, p. vi). Wertheimer shows how little founded is this regret. His biography is based primarily on sources heretofore unused: Metternich's private letters to Hudelist at Prague; the full daily reports of the Austrian secret police at home and abroad; the frequent reports and posthumous papers of the young Napoleon's governor, Count Dietrichstein; the diary of his tutor, Baron Obenaus; the private papers of the Metternich and Schwarzenberg families; and the archives of Prussia and Parma. He is thus able to correct on many a page the misstatements of memoir writers which have been accepted by historians. To give but two out of many instances: Metternich in his *Memoirs*, written long after Napoleon's fall and the unfortunate outcome of the marriage with Marie Louise, not unnaturally insists that the original idea of the